

S-E-C-R-E-T

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1
SECURITY INFORMATION

10 May 1952

ADPC Staff Meeting

The ADPC Staff Meeting was held at 1000 hours on 8 May 1952.

1. ADPC first reported on the status of the OPC program which had been submitted to the PSB. He stated that the PSB staff would recommend, at a luncheon meeting to be held that day, that the program be approved in toto by the PSB which should, however, reserve the right to exercise a continuing review over any policy questions which may come up. This, in effect, would constitute direction to OPC to go ahead with the building of the apparatus and to get the necessary personnel and material in place. ADPC said that he thought this was a very reasonable position for the PSB staff to take and was an encouraging sign. He visualized that on a continuing basis the PSB panel would give general guidance under NSC 10/5 and that the representatives would continue to give day-to-day guidance under NSC 10/2. Where policy questions arose, the Panel would refer the same to the PSB.

2. ADPC then directed his attention to, and briefly described, the situation which had arisen with respect to the functions of the CIA Inspector General. He stated that he strongly endorsed the inspection function and the proposition that certain plans and projects should and would be turned down, but stated that the inspection device should not be introduced into the chain of command. He directed that prompt and full response be given to any request of the Inspector General within the scope of his function but that any statement, order or request by the Inspector General not falling within the scope of his function be disregarded. ADPC stated that it was essential to the proper functioning of the inspection technique that he be kept informed by those present and their subordinates of all such statements, orders and requests and he directed Division Chiefs to instruct all case officers to keep them informed so that they, in turn, could advise him.

ADPC re-emphasized that he was strongly in favor of the inspection function and that maximum cooperation must be given. He also said that where mistakes have been made they must be faced and admitted and cautioned that emotional defense and pride of authorship should be avoided.

3. In connection with the review of existing projects, ADPC stated that whereas it had heretofore been necessary to approve projects in order to be able to build the apparatus, it now appeared as

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT
Destroy only with consent
of the Historical Staff

JUL 1 1952

HS/CSG-1577

S-E-C-R-E-T

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1

though the

100	120	1.2	
ABSTRACT		INDEX	

DATE 10 May 52

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1
SECURITY INFORMATION

10 May 1952

ADPC Staff Meeting

The ADPC Staff Meeting was held at 1000 hours on 8 May 1952.

1. ADPC first reported on the status of the OPC program which had been submitted to the PSB. He stated that the PSB staff would recommend, at a luncheon meeting to be held that day, that the program be approved in toto by the PSB which should, however, reserve the right to exercise a continuing review over any policy questions which may come up. This, in effect, would constitute direction to Ops to go ahead with the building of the apparatus and to get the necessary personnel and material in place. ADPC said that he thought this was a very reasonable position for the PSB staff to take and was an encouraging sign. He visualized that on a continuing basis the PSB panel would give general guidance under NSC 10/5 and that the representatives would continue to give day-to-day guidance under NSC 10/2. Where policy questions arose, the Panel would refer the same to the PSB.

2. ADPC then directed his attention to, and briefly described, the situation which had arisen with respect to the functions of the CIA Inspector General. He stated that he strongly endorsed the inspection function and the proposition that certain plans and projects should and would be turned down, but stated that the inspection device should not be introduced into the chain of command. He directed that prompt and full response be given to any request of the Inspector General within the scope of his function but that any statement, order or request by the Inspector General not falling within the scope of his function be disregarded. ADPC stated that it was essential to the proper functioning of the inspection technique that he be kept informed by those present and their subordinates of all such statements, orders and requests and he directed Division Chiefs to instruct all case officers to keep them informed so that they, in turn, could advise him.

ADPC re-emphasized that he was strongly in favor of the inspection function and that maximum cooperation must be given. He also said that where mistakes have been made they must be faced and admitted and cautioned that emotional defense and pride of authorship should be avoided.

3. In connection with the review of existing projects, ADPC stated that whereas it had heretofore been necessary to approve projects in order to be able to build the apparatus, it now appeared as

HISTORICAL DOCUMENT
Destroy only with consent
of the Historical Staff

JUL 1 1952

HS/CSG-1577

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1

though the

100	120	1.2	
ABSTRACT		INDEX	

DATE 18 May 52

though the apparatus might be built without prior approval of projects. He also pointed out that the greatest bottle neck in Ops activities was the lack of sufficient well-trained personnel to permit decentralization and a large degree of autonomy. He estimated that because of this bottle neck and others no heavier work load than that presently carried could be sustained before the end of Fiscal 1953. Since, however, existing projects could not be expected to match 1953 objectives, additional projects must be approved. It follows that the lowest priority and least profitable projects must be eliminated to make the maximum use of existing assets and particularly existing personnel. Projects eliminated under these standards might well be good projects and worth pursuing were additional personnel available. The basic objective is to hit the center of the target with the assets at hand, eliminating peripheral undertakings.

ADPC thereupon appointed a three-man committee consisting of DPO,^(*) SRI,⁽²⁾ and SPC⁽³⁾ to screen all existing projects to effect the above-mentioned eliminations. He said that at such screenings the interested Division Chief and C/OD should also be present and that C/PY and C/WP should participate as appropriate.

4. With respect to the status of merger, ADPC stated that he was sorry to report that he had had to nonconcur in a draft agreement prepared by ADSO. The latter had stated that in his opinion the differences were largely semantic and that he anticipated their resolution by 15 May. ADPC stated that he stood on two basic principles: First, decentralization to operational headquarters overseas and, second, merger down to the point needed to protect espionage operations. ADPC then reviewed briefly the status of decentralization planning in the respective Divisions, urged that such planning be continued, and stated that no sudden order would be issued requiring decentralization.

5. With respect to staff-line relationships, ADPC stated that these had to be improved. He pointed out that his own staff included the red, white and blue functions and directed that each Area Division Chief designate an opposite number within his division. He pointed out that Division Chiefs and PC Deputies were responsible for all three of these functions, the command responsibility being to DD/P and the staff responsibility to himself. He said that he spoke in DD/P's name and that what he said could be challenged to DD/P. He urged that matters be taken up with him in the first instance and that the existing split responsibility situation be not exploited. He urged that he be kept more fully informed and ordered that Area Division Chiefs instruct their case officers that where DD/P, DDCI or DCI gives a substantial and important order affecting Ops that he be informed immediately. Likewise, if Division personnel are summoned to the Hill, he

should be

should be informed ahead of time if possible, or afterwards if necessary. In response to a question, ADPC stated that informing EKO, EDA, DADPC, DFO or C/CD he considered to be informing him. Inclusion in the daily log was suggested as a good technique, and a telephone call or informal memorandum on a blue slip entirely acceptable as a method of advice.

ADPC directed that his staff officers meet with their opposite numbers in the Area Divisions at least once each week and he requested that EKO discuss with each Division Chief the designation of opposite staff numbers.

25X1A

6. ADPC called the attention of all present to [REDACTED] a report entitled "Split in Soviet Communist Leadership" stating that it was an excellent paper and was to be read by all. He directed DFO to see that a copy was made available to each Division Chief and that the latter read it, and he said that he proposed to call a meeting of Division Chiefs to critique the paper.

Called all Divisions 5-14-58 -mjb

7. EKO, referring to the emphasis on the building of the apparatus, called attention to existing regulations requiring a minimum of training and emphasized that this was particularly directed at staff division personnel. He also noted that during his recent trip he had seen evidence of inadequate briefing of personnel going to the field and stated that the creation of a central check-off point was being considered. In this connection he asked for suggestions from those present.

8. SAR stated that suggestions for deception operations might well be forthcoming from area personnel. He pointed out that this field is very complex and one in which it is easy to become involved. He therefore suggested that all suggestions with respect to deception operations be taken to ADPC or ADSO, as appropriate.

9. G/PY stated that he was planning a series of Area Division briefings on the functions and capabilities of the PY Division and invited any members of ADPC's staff to attend. He also stated that [REDACTED] had completed certain project evaluation reports which he felt might be useful to the Project Screening Committee above referred to.

25X1A

[REDACTED]

25X1A

Executive Assistant
DADPC

EDA/CCG/mjt
Distribution:

ADSO	C/CD	Chief and FC Deputy/SE
ADPC	C/WP	Chief and FC Deputy/FE
DADPC	C/CN	Chief and FC Deputy/NE
DFO	C/AM	Chief and FC Deputy/WN
SFC	C/FI	Chief and FC Deputy/SR
SRI	C/IO	EKO/DD/P and ADD/P (A)
SAL	Chief and FC Deputy/WE	Secretariat ([REDACTED])
C/LL	Chief and FC Deputy/EE	RE/FI

25X1A

SECRET (When Filled In)

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1

AREA OR FUNCTION	PERSONALITIES	DOCUMENT
HQ	OPC	Policy
	PSB	
	IG	NSC 10/2 25X1A
		NSC 10/5
		CLASS.: S
		NO.:
IDENTIFICATION OF DOCUMENT (author, form, addressee, title & length) Minutes of ADPC Staff Meeting for 8 May 1952 (prepared by 25X1A [REDACTED])		LOCATION: HS/CSG- 1577 ✓

ABSTRACT

ADPC reported on status of the OPC program submitted to PSB. He said he thought that the PSB panel would give general guidance under NSC 10/5 and the Representatives would give day to day guidance under 10/2.

He brought up functions of IG, establishment of [REDACTED] 25X1A and staff-line relationship.

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP83-00036R001100070029-1